arXiv:1603.05375v3 [math.RA] 26 Dec 2016

Minimax theorem for the spectral radius of the product of non-negative matrices

Victor Kozyakin*

Abstract

We prove the minimax equality for the spectral radius $\rho(AB)$ of the product of matrices $A \in \mathscr{A}$ and $B \in \mathscr{B}$, where $\mathscr{A}$ and $\mathscr{B}$ are compact sets of non-negative matrices of dimensions $N \times M$ and $M \times N$, respectively, satisfying the so-called hourglass alternative.

Keywords: matrix products; non-negative matrices; spectral radius; minimax; saddle point

AMS Subject Classification: 15A45; 15B48; 49J35

1 Introduction

In the article, we consider the question about conditions under which, for compact (closed and bounded) sets of matrices $\mathscr{A}$ and $\mathscr{B}$, the minimax equality holds

$$\min_{A\in\mathscr{A}} \max_{B\in\mathscr{B}} \rho(AB) = \max_{B\in\mathscr{B}} \min_{A\in\mathscr{A}} \rho(AB), \tag{1}$$

where $\rho(\cdot)$ is the spectral radius of a matrix.

Clearly, equality (1) is not true, in general, see Example 4 below. However, some time ago in a private discussion Eugene Asarin conjectured that equality (1) still might be valid for certain classes of non-negative matrices. This conjecture, based on the analysis of properties of the matrix multiplication games [1], was supported by numerous computer experiments indicating that equality (1) holds for the classes of matrices with the so-called 'independent row uncertainty' [2] (see the definition in Section 2). Unfortunately, attempts to formally prove the required equality, even for the simplest cases, did not lead to success for a long time.

The main cause of arising difficulties was the fact that most of the classical proofs of the minimax theorem for functions $f(x, y)$ assume some kind of convexity or quasiconvexity

*Kharkevich Institute for Information Transmission Problems, Russian Academy of Sciences, Bolshoj Karetny lane 19, Moscow 127051, Russia, e-mail: kozyakin@iitp.ru

Kotel'nikov Institute of Radio-engineering and Electronics, Russian Academy of Sciences, Mokhovaya 11-7, Moscow 125009, Russia

in one of the arguments of the function and concavity or quasiconcavity in the other (see, e.g., [3] and also rather old but still urgent survey [4]).

As is known, the spectral radius of a matrix has a number of convex-like properties, see, e.g., [5–8]. In particular, the spectral radius of a nonnegative matrix is both quasiconvex and quasiconcave with respect to every row of a matrix as well as to its diagonal elements (but not with respect to the whole matrix). However, we were not able to find any analogs of convexity/quasiconvexity or concavity/quasiconcavity of the function $\rho(AB)$ with respect to the matrix variables A and B. Moreover, in view of the identity $\rho(AB) \equiv \rho(BA)$ the matrices A and B play, in a sense, an equivalent role in equality (1). Therefore, any kind of 'convexity' of the function $\rho(AB)$ with respect, say, to the variable A would have to involve its 'concavity' with respect to the same variable, which casts doubt on the applicability of the 'convex-concave' arguments in a possible proof of (1).

Recently, in [1] the author has managed to overcome the indicated difficulties and to prove equality (1) for the classes of matrices with independent row uncertainty arising in the theory of matrix multiplication games [1], the theory of switching systems [9] and so forth. The relevant proof, as is often the case, is turned out to be easy enough, and its idea was based on the so-called hourglass alternative, first formulated in [1] and in a more general form later used in [10] for proving the finiteness conjecture for some classes of non-negative matrices.

The goal of the article is to prove equality (1) for more general classes of matrices, the so-called classes of non-negative $\mathcal{H}$-sets of matrices resulting from axiomatization of the statements constituting the hourglass alternative.

The structure of the work is as follows. In Section 2, we recall the formulation of the hourglass alternative for the sets of positive matrices. Then we outline the principal properties of the sets of matrices satisfying the hourglass alternative, $\mathcal{H}$-sets of matrices, among which the most important property is that the totality of all $\mathcal{H}$-sets of matrices, supplemented by the zero and the identity matrices, forms a semiring with respect to the Minkowski set operations. In Section 3, we show in Theorem 3.2 that the spectral radius $\rho(AB)$, with the matrices A and B taken from $\mathcal{H}$-sets of matrices, has a saddle point. From this the main result, Theorem 3.3, asserting the validity of equality (1) immediately follows. The proof of Theorem 3.2 is given in Section 4, its idea is heavily based on the hourglass alternative.

2 Hourglass alternative and $\mathcal{H}$-sets of matrices

Following [10], we recall necessary definitions and facts. For vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we write $x \geqslant y$ or $x > y$, if all coordinates of the vector x are not less or strictly greater, respectively, than the corresponding coordinates of the vector y. As usual, a vector or a matrix is called non-negative (positive) if all its elements are non-negative (positive).

Denote by $\mathcal{M}(N, M)$ the set of all real $(N \times M)$-matrices. This set can be identified with space $\mathbb{R}^{N\times M}$ and therefore, depending on the context, it can be interpreted as a topological, metric or normed space. A set of positive matrices $\mathscr{A} \subset \mathcal{M}(N, M)$ will be

called $\mathcal{H}$-*set* or *hourglass set* if for each pair $(\tilde{A}, u)$, where $\tilde{A}$ is a matrix from the set $\mathscr{A}$ and u is a positive vector, the following assertions hold:

H1: *either* $Au \geqslant \tilde{A}u$ *for all* $A \in \mathscr{A}$ *or there exists a matrix* $\bar{A} \in \mathscr{A}$ *such that* $\bar{A}u \leqslant \tilde{A}u$ *and* $\bar{A}u \neq \tilde{A}u$*;*

H2: *either* $Au \leqslant \tilde{A}u$ *for all* $A \in \mathscr{A}$ *or there exists a matrix* $\bar{A} \in \mathscr{A}$ *such that* $\bar{A}u \geqslant \tilde{A}u$ *and* $\bar{A}u \neq \tilde{A}u$*.*

These assertions have a simple geometrical interpretation. Given a matrix $\tilde{A} \in \mathscr{A}$ and a vector $u > 0$, imagine that the sets $\{x : x \leqslant \tilde{A}u\}$ and $\{x : x \geqslant \tilde{A}u\}$ form the lower and upper bulbs of an hourglass with the neck at the point $\tilde{A}u$. Let us treat the elements Au as grains of sand. Then according to assertions H1 and H2 either all the grains Au fill one of the bulbs (upper or lower), or there remains at least one grain in the other bulb (lower or upper, respectively). Such an interpretation gives reason to call assertions H1 and H2 the *hourglass alternative*. This alternative will play a key role in what follows. It was raised up and used by the author in [1] to analyze the minimax relations between the spectral radii of matrix products, and also in [10] to prove the finiteness conjecture for non-negative $\mathcal{H}$-sets of matrices.

Failure of the inequality $u \geqslant v$ for vectors u and v does not imply, in general, the inverse inequality $u \leqslant v$. From this it follows that assertions H1 and H2 are not valid for arbitrary sets of matrices $\mathscr{A}$: non-fulfillment of the inequality $Au \geqslant \tilde{A}u$ for all $A \in \mathscr{A}$ does not mean that for some matrix $\bar{A} \in \mathscr{A}$ the inverse inequality $\bar{A}u \leqslant \tilde{A}u$ will be valid. And similarly, non-fulfillment of the inequality $Au \leqslant \tilde{A}u$ for all $A \in \mathscr{A}$ does not mean that for some matrix $\bar{A} \in \mathscr{A}$ the inverse inequality $\bar{A}u \geqslant \tilde{A}u$ will be valid.

In what follows, we will need to make various kinds of limit transitions with the matrices from the sets under consideration as well as with the sets of matrices themselves. In this connection, it is natural to restrict our considerations to compact sets of matrices. By $\mathcal{H}(N, M)$ we denote the set of all compact $\mathcal{H}$-sets of positive $(N \times M)$-matrices.

Present some examples of $\mathcal{H}$-sets.

Example 1. A trivial example of $\mathcal{H}$-sets are *linearly ordered* sets of positive matrices $\mathscr{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n\}$, i.e. the sets of matrices whose elements satisfy the inequalities $0 < A_1 < A_2 < \cdots < A_n$. In this case, for each $u > 0$, the vectors $A_1u, A_2u, \ldots, A_nu$ are strictly positive and linearly ordered, which yields the validity of assertions H1 and H2 for $\mathscr{A}$. In particular, any set consisting of a single positive matrix is an $\mathcal{H}$-set. □

Example 2. A less trivial and more interesting example of $\mathcal{H}$-sets, as shown in [1, Lemma 4] and [10, Lemma 1], is the class of sets of positive matrices with independent row uncertainty. Following [2], a set of matrices $\mathscr{A} \subset \mathcal{M}(N, M)$ is called an *IRU-set* (*independent row uncertainty set*) if it consists of all the matrices

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots & a_{1M} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \cdots & a_{2M} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ a_{N1} & a_{N2} & \cdots & a_{NM} \end{pmatrix},$$

wherein each of the rows $a_i = (a_{i1}, a_{i2}, \ldots, a_{iM})$ belongs to some set of M-rows $\mathscr{A}_i$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$. Clearly, a set $\mathscr{A} \subset \mathcal{M}(N, M)$ is compact if and only if each set of rows $\mathscr{A}_i$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$, is compact. $\square$

To construct another examples of $\mathcal{H}$-sets of matrices let us introduce the operations of Minkowski summation and multiplication for sets of matrices:

$$\mathscr{A} + \mathscr{B} = \{A + B : A \in \mathscr{A},\ B \in \mathscr{B}\}, \quad \mathscr{A}\mathscr{B} = \{AB : A \in \mathscr{A},\ B \in \mathscr{B}\},$$

and also the operation of multiplication of a set of matrices by a scalar:

$$t\mathscr{A} = \mathscr{A}t = \{tA : t \in \mathbb{R},\ A \in \mathscr{A}\}.$$

The operation of addition is *admissible* if and only if the matrices from the sets $\mathscr{A}$ and $\mathscr{B}$ are of the same size, while the operation of multiplication is *admissible* if and only if the sizes of the matrices from sets $\mathscr{A}$ and $\mathscr{B}$ are matched: dimension of the rows of the matrices from $\mathscr{A}$ is the same as dimension of the columns of the matrices from $\mathscr{B}$. Problems with matching of sizes do not arise when one considers the sets consisting of square matrices of the same size.

Example 3. As shown in [10, Theorem 2], the totality of $\mathcal{H}$-sets of matrices is algebraically closed under the operations of Minkowski summation and multiplication:

- $\mathscr{A} + \mathscr{B} \in \mathcal{H}(N, M)$ if $\mathscr{A}, \mathscr{B} \in \mathcal{H}(N, M)$;
- $\mathscr{A}\mathscr{B} \in \mathcal{H}(N, Q)$ if $\mathscr{A} \in \mathcal{H}(N, M)$ and $\mathscr{B} \in \mathcal{H}(M, Q)$;
- $t\mathscr{A} = \mathscr{A}t \in \mathcal{H}(N, M)$ if $t > 0$ and $\mathscr{A} \in \mathcal{H}(N, M)$.

However, in general, $\mathscr{A}(\mathscr{B}_1 + \mathscr{B}_2) \neq \mathscr{A}\mathscr{B}_1 + \mathscr{A}\mathscr{B}_2$ and $(\mathscr{A}_1 + \mathscr{A}_2)\mathscr{B} \neq \mathscr{A}_1\mathscr{B} + \mathscr{A}_2\mathscr{B}$, i.e. the Minkowski operations are not associative. In particular, $\mathscr{A} + \mathscr{A} \neq 2\mathscr{A}$.

From here it follows that for any integers $n, d \geqslant 1$, the totality $\mathcal{H}(N, M)$ contains all the polynomial sets of matrices

$$P(\mathscr{A}_1, \mathscr{A}_1, \ldots, \mathscr{A}_n) = \sum_{k=1}^{d} \sum_{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_k \in \{1,2,\ldots,n\}} p_{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_k} \mathscr{A}_{i_1} \mathscr{A}_{i_2} \cdots \mathscr{A}_{i_k}, \tag{2}$$

where $\mathscr{A}_i \in \mathcal{H}(N_i, M_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, and the scalar coefficients $p_{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_k}$ are positive. One must only ensure that the products $\mathscr{A}_{i_1} \mathscr{A}_{i_2} \cdots \mathscr{A}_{i_k}$ would be admissible and determine the sets of matrices of dimension $N \times M$. $\square$

2.1 Closure of the set $\mathcal{H}(N, M)$

Given some matrix norm $\|\cdot\|$ on the set $\mathcal{M}(N, M)$, denote by $\mathcal{K}(N, M)$ the totality of all compact subsets of $\mathcal{M}(N, M)$. Then for any two sets of matrices $\mathscr{A}, \mathscr{B} \in \mathcal{K}(N, M)$ the *Hausdorff metric*

$$H(\mathscr{A}, \mathscr{B}) = \max\left\{ \sup_{A \in \mathscr{A}} \inf_{B \in \mathscr{B}} \|A - B\|,\ \sup_{B \in \mathscr{B}} \inf_{A \in \mathscr{A}} \|A - B\| \right\}$$

is defined, in which $\mathcal{K}(N,M)$ becomes a full metric space. Then $\mathcal{H}(N,M) \subset \mathcal{K}(N,M)$, equipped with the Hausdorff metric, also becomes a metric space.

As is known, see, e.g., [11, Chapter E, Proposition 5], any mapping $F(\mathscr{A})$ acting from $\mathcal{K}(N,M)$ into itself is continuous in the Hausdorff metric at some point $\mathscr{A}_0$ if and only if it is both upper and lower semicontinuous. It is known also [12, Section 1.3] that the mappings

$$(\mathscr{A},\mathscr{B}) \mapsto \mathscr{A}+\mathscr{B}, \quad (\mathscr{A},\mathscr{B}) \mapsto \mathscr{A}\mathscr{B}, \quad \mathscr{A} \mapsto \mathscr{A}\times\mathscr{A}\times\cdots\times\mathscr{A}, \quad \mathscr{A} \mapsto \mathrm{co}(\mathscr{A}),$$

where $\mathscr{A}$ and $\mathscr{B}$ are compact sets, are both upper and lower semicontinuous. Therefore these mappings are continuous in the Hausdorff metric, and the same continuity properties has any polynomial mapping (2).

Denote by $\overline{\mathcal{H}}(N,M)$ the closure of the set $\mathcal{H}(N,M)$ in the Hausdorff metric. Since the Minkowski summation and multiplication of matrix sets are continuous in the Hausdorff metric then, as follows from Example 3, all the 'polynomial' sets of matrices with the arguments from $\overline{\mathcal{H}}$-sets of matrices (with matched dimensions) take values again in the $\overline{\mathcal{H}}$-set of matrices. However, the answer to the question when, for a specific $\mathscr{A}$, the inclusion $\mathscr{A} \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}(N,M)$ holds, requires further analysis. We restrict ourselves to the description of only one case where the answer to this question can be given explicitly [10, Lemma 4]: *the values of any polynomial mapping* (2) *with the arguments from finite linearly ordered sets of non-negative matrices or from IRU-sets of non-negative matrices belong to the closure in the Hausdorff metric of the totality of positive $\mathcal{H}$-sets of matrices.*

3 Main results

In the theory of functions, one of the fundamental criteria of feasibility of the minimax equality is the following *saddle point principle*, see [13, Section 13.4].

Lemma 3.1. *Let $f(x,y)$ be a continuous function on the product of compact spaces $X \times Y$. Then*

$$\min_x \max_y f(x,y) \geqslant \max_y \min_x f(x,y).$$

The exact equality holds if and only if there exists a saddle point, i.e. a point (x_0,y_0) satisfying the inequalities

$$f(x_0,y) \leqslant f(x_0,y_0) \leqslant f(x,y_0)$$

for all $x \in X$, $y \in Y$, and then

$$\min_x \max_y f(x,y) = \max_y \min_x f(x,y) = f(x_0,y_0).$$

This criterion explains the importance of the following saddle point theorem for the study of the question about minimax equality (1).

Theorem 3.2. *Let $\mathscr{A} \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}(N,M)$ and $\mathscr{B} \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}(M,N)$. Then there exist matrices $\tilde{A} \in \mathscr{A}$ and $\tilde{B} \in \mathscr{B}$ such that*

$$\rho(\tilde{A}B) \leqslant \rho(\tilde{A}\tilde{B}) \leqslant \rho(A\tilde{B}) \tag{3}$$

for all $A \in \mathrm{co}(\mathscr{A})$ and $B \in \mathrm{co}(\mathscr{B})$, where $\mathrm{co}(\cdot)$ denotes the convex hull of a set.

In a finite-dimensional space the convex hull of a compact set is a compact set. Now as the sets of matrices $\mathscr{A}$ and $\mathscr{B}$ can be treated as subsets of finite-dimensional spaces $\mathbb{R}^{N\times M}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{M\times N}$, respectively, then the sets $\mathrm{co}(\mathscr{A})$ and $\mathrm{co}(\mathscr{B})$ in Theorem 3.2 are compact. If $\mathscr{A}$ is an IRU-set of matrices constituted by a set of rows $\mathscr{A}_1, \mathscr{A}_2, \ldots, \mathscr{A}_N$, then its convex hull $\mathrm{co}(\mathscr{A})$ is the IRU-set constituted by the set of rows $\mathrm{co}(\mathscr{A}_1)$, $\mathrm{co}(\mathscr{A}_2)$, $\ldots$, $\mathrm{co}(\mathscr{A}_N)$. If $\mathscr{A}$ is an $\mathcal{H}$-set of matrices then the structure of the set $\mathrm{co}(\mathscr{A})$ is more complicated.

In Theorem 3.2 the saddle point $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B})$ belongs to the set $\mathscr{A} \times \mathscr{B}$, while the matrices A and B, for which the inequality (3) holds, belong to the wider sets: $(A,B) \in \mathrm{co}(\mathscr{A}) \times \mathrm{co}(\mathscr{B})$. This makes possible deducing a variety of minimax theorems for the spectral radius $\rho(AB)$ from Theorem 3.2.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $\mathscr{A} \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}(N,M)$ and $\mathscr{B} \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}(M,N)$. Then there exists a number $\rho_* \geqslant 0$ such that*

$$\min_{A\in\tilde{\mathscr{A}}} \max_{B\in\tilde{\mathscr{B}}} \rho(AB) = \max_{B\in\tilde{\mathscr{B}}} \min_{A\in\tilde{\mathscr{A}}} \rho(AB) = \rho_*$$

for any compact sets of matrices $\tilde{\mathscr{A}}$ and $\tilde{\mathscr{B}}$ satisfying

$$\mathscr{A} \subseteq \tilde{\mathscr{A}} \subseteq \mathrm{co}(\mathscr{A}), \quad \mathscr{B} \subseteq \tilde{\mathscr{B}} \subseteq \mathrm{co}(\mathscr{B}).$$

To prove this theorem, it suffices to note that, by Theorem 3.2 inequalities (3) will take place for all $A \in \tilde{\mathscr{A}}$ and $B \in \tilde{\mathscr{B}}$, and then to apply Lemma 3.1.

Choosing in Theorem 3.2 different sets $\tilde{\mathscr{A}}$ and $\tilde{\mathscr{B}}$, one may obtain a variety of minimax equalities. For example, putting a $\tilde{\mathscr{A}} = \mathscr{A}$ and $\tilde{\mathscr{B}} = \mathscr{B}$, we get (1). Putting $\tilde{\mathscr{A}} = \mathrm{co}(\mathscr{A})$ and $\tilde{\mathscr{B}} = \mathrm{co}(\mathscr{B})$, we get another minimax equality:

$$\min_{A\in\mathrm{co}(\mathscr{A})} \max_{B\in\mathrm{co}(\mathscr{B})} \rho(AB) = \max_{B\in\mathrm{co}(\mathscr{B})} \min_{A\in\mathrm{co}(\mathscr{A})} \rho(AB).$$

It is worth noting that the minimax value of the spectral radius $\rho(AB)$ in the last equality, and the value of the corresponding minimax in equality (1) coincide.

The next example demonstrates that Theorem 3.3 is not valid for general sets of matrices.

Example 4. Consider the sets of matrices

$$\mathscr{A} = \mathscr{B} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}.$$

Then

$$\min_{A\in\mathscr{A}} \max_{B\in\mathscr{B}} \rho(AB) = 1, \quad \max_{B\in\mathscr{B}} \min_{A\in\mathscr{A}} \rho(AB) = 0,$$

and the minimax equality (1) does not hold in this case. □

The spectral radius $\rho(AB)$ of the product of (rectangular) matrices A and B is not changed by permutation of these matrices and their transposition. This implies the following corollary.

Corollary 3.4. *Theorems 3.2 and 3.3 hold if to replace the function $\rho(AB)$ by $\rho(BA)$, as well as by $\rho(A^{\mathsf{T}}B^{\mathsf{T}})$ or by $\rho(B^{\mathsf{T}}A^{\mathsf{T}})$.*

4 Proof of Theorem 3.2

Before proceeding to the proof of Theorem 3.2, we recall some definitions and establish auxiliary facts.

The *spectral radius* of an $(N \times N)$-matrix A is defined as the maximal modulus of its eigenvalues and denoted by $\rho(A)$. The spectral radius depends continuously on the matrix. If $A > 0$ then, by the Perron-Frobenius theorem [14, Theorem 8.2.2], the number $\rho(A)$ is a simple eigenvalue of the matrix A, and all the other eigenvalues of A are strictly less than $\rho(A)$ by modulus. The eigenvector $v = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_N)^{\mathsf{T}}$ corresponding to the eigenvalue $\rho(A)$ (normalized, for example, by the equation $v_1 + v_2 + \dots + v_N = 1$) is uniquely determined and positive.

For ease of reference, we summarize some of the well-known statements of the theory of non-negative matrices, see, e.g., [10, Lemma 2] or [1, Lemma 3] for proofs.

Lemma 4.1. *Let A be a non-negative $(N \times N)$-matrix. Then the following assertions hold:*

(i) *if $Au \leqslant \rho u$ for some vector $u > 0$, then $\rho \geqslant 0$ and $\rho(A) \leqslant \rho$;*

(ii) *moreover, if in conditions of* (i) *$A > 0$ and $Au \neq \rho u$, then $\rho(A) < \rho$;*

(iii) *if $Au \geqslant \rho u$ for some non-zero vector $u \geqslant 0$ and some number $\rho \geqslant 0$, then $\rho(A) \geqslant \rho$;*

(iv) *moreover, if in conditions of* (iii) *$A > 0$ and $Au \neq \rho u$, then $\rho(A) > \rho$.*

To analyze the convergence of sequences $\mathscr{A}_n \to \mathscr{A}_\infty$ in the Hausdorff metric, it is convenient to use the following lemma, see, e.g., [11, Chapter E, Propositions 2, 4].

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\mathscr{A}_n \in \mathcal{K}(N, M)$ for $n = 1, 2, \dots$. Then $\mathscr{A}_n \to \mathscr{A}_\infty$ in the Hausdorff metric if and only if the following assertions are valid:*

(i) *for any sequence of indices $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$, any sequence of matrices $A_{n_i} \in \mathscr{A}_{n_i}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots$, contains a subsequence converging to some element from $\mathscr{A}_\infty$;*

(ii) *for any matrix $A_\infty \in \mathscr{A}_\infty$ and any sequence of indices $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$, there exists a sequence of matrices $A_{n_i} \in \mathscr{A}_{n_i}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots$, converging to A_∞.*

At last, we will need the following simplified version of Berge's Maximum Theorem, see [15, Ch. 6, § 3, Theorems 1, 2] and also [11, Ch. E, Sect. 3].

Lemma 4.3. *If φ is a continuous numerical function in the product of topological spaces $X \times Y$, where Y is compact, then the functions $M(x) = \max_{y\in Y} \varphi(x, y)$ and $m(x) = \min_{y\in Y} \varphi(x, y)$ are continuous.*

Note that in the full version of the Maximum Theorem the set over which the maximum is taken in the definitions of $M(x)$ and $m(x)$ is allowed to vary with x.

We are now ready to prove Theorem 3.2.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. First, let $\mathscr{A} \in \mathcal{H}(N, M)$ and $\mathscr{B} \in \mathcal{H}(M, N)$. To construct the matrices $\tilde{A} \in \mathscr{A}$ and $\tilde{B} \in \mathscr{B}$ satisfying (3) we proceed as follows. Let us note that for each $B \in \mathscr{B}$ there exists a matrix $A_B \in \mathscr{A}$ which minimizes (in $A \in \mathscr{A}$) the quantity $\rho(AB)$. Such a matrix A_B exists by virtue of compactness of the set $\mathscr{A}$ and continuity of the function $\rho(AB)$ in A and B. Then, for each matrix $B \in \mathscr{B}$, the relations

$$\rho(A_B B) = \min_{A\in\mathscr{A}} \rho(AB) \leqslant \rho(AB)$$

will be valid for all $A \in \mathscr{A}$. Here, by Lemma 4.3 the function $\min_{A\in\mathscr{A}} \rho(AB)$ is continuous in B, and therefore there exists a matrix $\tilde{B} \in \mathscr{B}$ that maximizes its value on the set $\mathscr{B}$.

Set $\tilde{A} = A_{\tilde{B}}$. In this case

$$\max_{B\in\mathscr{B}} \rho(A_B B) = \max_{B\in\mathscr{B}} \min_{A\in\mathscr{A}} \rho(AB) = \min_{A\in\mathscr{A}} \rho(A\tilde{B}) = \rho(A_{\tilde{B}}\tilde{B}) = \rho(\tilde{A}\tilde{B}), \tag{4}$$

where the first equality follows from the definition of the matrix A_B, the second follows from the definition of $\tilde{B}$, the third follows from the definition of $A_{\tilde{B}}$, and the fourth follows from the definition of $\tilde{A}$.

Let $v = (v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_N)^{\mathsf{T}}$ be the positive eigenvector of the $(N \times N)$-matrix $\tilde{A}\tilde{B}$ corresponding to the eigenvalue $\rho(\tilde{A}\tilde{B})$ which is uniquely defined up to a positive factor. By denoting $w = \tilde{B}v \in \mathbb{R}^M$ we obtain $\rho(\tilde{A}\tilde{B})v = \tilde{A}w$. Let us show that in this case

$$\rho(\tilde{A}\tilde{B})v \leqslant Aw \tag{5}$$

for all $A \in \mathscr{A}$. Indeed, otherwise by assertion H1 of the hourglass alternative there exists a matrix $\bar{A} \in \mathscr{A}$ such that $\rho(\tilde{A}\tilde{B})v \geqslant \bar{A}w$ and $\rho(\tilde{A}\tilde{B})v \neq \bar{A}w$ which implies, by definition of the vector w, that $\rho(\tilde{A}\tilde{B})v \geqslant \bar{A}\tilde{B}v$ and $\rho(\tilde{A}\tilde{B})v \neq \bar{A}\tilde{B}v$. Then by Lemma 4.1 $\rho(\bar{A}\tilde{B}) < \rho(\tilde{A}\tilde{B})$, and therefore $\min_{A\in\mathscr{A}} \rho(A\tilde{B}) < \rho(\tilde{A}\tilde{B})$, which contradicts to (4). This contradiction completes the proof of inequality (5).

Similarly, now we show that

$$w \geqslant Bv \tag{6}$$

for all $B \in \mathscr{B}$. Again, assuming the contrary by assertion H2 of the hourglass alternative there exists a matrix $\bar{B} \in \mathscr{B}$ such that $w \leqslant \bar{B}v$ and $w \neq \bar{B}v$. This last inequality, together with (5) applied to the matrix $A_{\bar{B}}$, yields $\rho(\tilde{A}\tilde{B})v \leqslant A_{\bar{B}}\bar{B}v$ and $\rho(\tilde{A}\tilde{B})v \neq A_{\bar{B}}\bar{B}v$. Then by Lemma 4.1 $\rho(\tilde{A}\tilde{B}) < \rho(A_{\bar{B}}\bar{B})$, and therefore $\max_{B\in\mathscr{B}} \rho(A_B B) > \rho(\tilde{A}\tilde{B})$, which again contradicts to (4). This contradiction completes the proof of inequality (6).

Inequality (5) implies, by definition of the vector w, that

$$\rho(\tilde{A}\tilde{B})v \leqslant A\tilde{B}v$$

for all $A \in \mathscr{A}$. Then this inequality holds also for all $A \in \mathrm{co}(\mathscr{A})$, which by Lemma 4.1 yields

$$\rho(\tilde{A}\tilde{B}) \leqslant \rho(A\tilde{B}), \qquad A \in \mathrm{co}(\mathscr{A}). \tag{7}$$

Similarly, left-multiplying the inequality (6) to the positive matrix $\tilde{A}$, and taking into account the equality $\rho(\tilde{A}\tilde{B})v = \tilde{A}w$, we see that

$$\rho(\tilde{A}\tilde{B})v \geqslant \tilde{A}Bv$$

for all $B \in \mathscr{B}$. Then this inequality holds also for all $B \in \mathrm{co}(\mathscr{B})$, which by Lemma 4.1 yields

$$\rho(\tilde{A}B) \leqslant \rho(\tilde{A}\tilde{B}), \qquad B \in \mathrm{co}(\mathscr{B}). \tag{8}$$

Inequalities (7) and (8) complete the proof of the theorem in the case when $\mathscr{A} \in \mathcal{H}(N, M)$ and $\mathscr{B} \in \mathcal{H}(M, N)$.

We proceed to the final stage of the proof. Let now $\mathscr{A} \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}(N, M)$ and $\mathscr{B} \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}(M, N)$. Then, for $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, there exist sets of matrices $\mathscr{A}_n \in \mathcal{H}(N, M)$ and $\mathscr{B}_n \in \mathcal{H}(M, N)$ such that

$$\mathscr{A}_n \to \mathscr{A}, \quad \mathscr{B}_n \to \mathscr{B}. \tag{9}$$

Therefore, as already shown, in virtue of (7) and (8), for each n, there exist matrices $\tilde{A}_n \in \mathscr{A}_n$ and $\tilde{B}_n \in \mathscr{B}_n$ such that

$$\rho(\tilde{A}_n\tilde{B}_n) \leqslant \rho(A\tilde{B}_n), \qquad A \in \mathrm{co}(\mathscr{A}_n), \tag{10}$$

$$\rho(\tilde{A}_n\tilde{B}_n) \geqslant \rho(\tilde{A}_nB), \qquad B \in \mathrm{co}(\mathscr{B}_n). \tag{11}$$

By (9), in view of the compactness of the sets $\mathscr{A}$, $\mathscr{B}$, $\mathscr{A}_n$ and $\mathscr{B}_n$, each of the sequences of matrices $\{A_n\}$ and $\{B_n\}$ without loss of generality may be treated convergent: $\tilde{A}_n \to \tilde{A}$ and $\tilde{B}_n \to \tilde{B}$, where due to assertion (i) of Lemma 4.2 $\tilde{A} \in \mathscr{A}$ and $\tilde{B} \in \mathscr{B}$, i.e.

$$\tilde{A}_n \to \tilde{A} \in \mathscr{A}, \quad \tilde{B}_n \to \tilde{B} \in \mathscr{B}. \tag{12}$$

Finally, let us take an arbitrary matrix $A \in \mathrm{co}(\mathscr{A})$. Then, by definition of the convex hull of a set, the matrix A is a finite convex combination of matrices from $\mathscr{A}$, i.e.

$$A = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \lambda_i A^{(i)},$$

where r is some integer, λ_i are non-negative numbers whose sum is 1, and $A^{(i)} \in \mathscr{A}$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, r$. Then by assertion (ii) of Lemma 4.2 for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, r$ there exist

sequences of matrices $\{A_n^{(i)}\}$ such that $A_n^{(i)} \in \mathscr{A}_n$ for all $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, and $A_n^{(i)} \to \mathscr{A}^{(i)}$. Therefore the matrices

$$A_n = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \lambda_i A_n^{(i)} \in \mathrm{co}(\mathscr{A}_n)$$

satisfy the limit relation

$$A_n \to A. \tag{13}$$

Now, substituting the matrices $\tilde{A}_n$, $\tilde{B}_n$ and A_n in (10) we obtain

$$\rho(\tilde{A}_n \tilde{B}_n) \leqslant \rho(A_n \tilde{B}_n). \tag{14}$$

Taking the limit in (14), due to (12) and (13) we obtain the inequality (7) valid, this time, in the case when $\mathscr{A} \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}(N, M)$ and $\mathscr{B} \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}(M, N)$. Similarly we can prove inequality (8) in the case when $\mathscr{A} \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}(N, M)$ and $\mathscr{B} \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}(M, N)$.

The proof of Theorem 3.2 is completed. □

Acknowledgments

The author is genuinely grateful to Eugene Asarin for numerous inspiring discussions and constructive criticism.

Funding

The work was carried out at the Institute of Radio-engineering and Electronics, Russian Academy of Sciences, and was supported by the Russian Science Foundation, Project no. 16–11–00063.

References

[1] E. Asarin, J. Cervelle, A. Degorre, C. Dima, F. Horn, V. Kozyakin, Entropy games and matrix multiplication games, in: N. Ollinger, H. Vollmer (Eds.), 33rd Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, (STACS 2016), Vol. 47 of Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs), Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2016, pp. 11:1–11:14. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.STACS.2016.11.

[2] V. D. Blondel, Y. Nesterov, Polynomial-time computation of the joint spectral radius for some sets of nonnegative matrices, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. 31 (3) (2009) 865–876. doi:10.1137/080723764.

[3] M. Sion, On general minimax theorems, Pacific J. Math. 8 (1958) 171–176.

[4] S. Simons, Minimax theorems and their proofs, in: Minimax and applications, Vol. 4 of Nonconvex Optim. Appl., Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1995, pp. 1–23. doi:10.1007/978-1-4613-3557-3_1.

[5] J. F. C. Kingman, A convexity property of positive matrices, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2) 12 (1961) 283–284.

[6] S. Friedland, Convex spectral functions, Linear and Multilinear Algebra 9 (4) (1980/81) 299–316. doi:10.1080/03081088108817381.

[7] L. Elsner, On convexity properties of the spectral radius of nonnegative matrices, Linear Algebra Appl. 61 (1984) 31–35. doi:10.1016/0024-3795(84)90020-X.

[8] R. D. Nussbaum, Convexity and log convexity for the spectral radius, Linear Algebra Appl. 73 (1986) 59–122. doi:10.1016/0024-3795(86)90233-8.

[9] V. Kozyakin, Constructive stability and stabilizability of positive linear discrete-time switching systems, ArXiv.org e-Print archive (Nov. 2015). arXiv:1511.05665.

[10] V. Kozyakin, Hourglass alternative and the finiteness conjecture for the spectral characteristics of sets of non-negative matrices, Linear Algebra Appl. 489 (2016) 167–185. arXiv:1507.00492, doi:10.1016/j.laa.2015.10.017.

[11] E. A. Ok, Real analysis with economic applications, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2007.

[12] Y. G. Borisovich, B. D. Gel′man, A. D. Myshkis, V. V. Obukhovskii, Multivalued mappings, Journal of Soviet Mathematics 24 (6) (1984) 719–791. doi:10.1007/BF01305758.

[13] J. von Neumann, O. Morgenstern, Theory of Games and Economic Behavior, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1947, 2d ed.

[14] R. A. Horn, C. R. Johnson, Matrix analysis, 2nd Edition, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013.

[15] C. Berge, Topological spaces, Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, NY, 1997, including a treatment of multi-valued functions, vector spaces and convexity, Translated from the French original by E. M. Patterson, Reprint of the 1963 translation.